			UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Adtress COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 223 www.uspto.gov	Trademark Office OR PATENTS
PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/965,135	09/27/2001	Walter H. Gunzburg	2316.1002-001	2027
25297 7590 04/29/2005			EXAMINER	
	LSON & TAYLOR, P	FOLEY, SHANON A		
3100 TOWER BLVD SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DURHAM, NC 27707			1648	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.

.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,135	GUNZBURG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shanon Foley	1648
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become ABA	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>13 December 2004</u> .	
· · ·	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) <u>5,8-17 and 22-25</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-17</u> is/are with 5) Claim(s)	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)] accepted or b) discred to b	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o		, , ()
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by t	the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for 	uments have been received. Iments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No. <u>08/925214</u> . received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

•

DETAILED ACTION

In the amendment filed December 13, 2004, applicant canceled claims 1-4, 18-21,

amended claims 5, 8 and added new claims 23-25. Claims 5, 8-17 and 22-25 are pending, claims 9-17 are withdrawn from consideration due to a nonelected invention and claims 5, 8 and 22-25 are under consideration.

Request for Reconsideration

The request filed on 12/13/4 for a <u>Request for Continued Examination</u> (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/965135 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 8 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gunzburg et al. (Nature. 1993; 364 (July 8): 154-158), Gilboa (US 5,658,775) and Vile et al.

(Cancer Research. 1993; 53 (5): 962-7, abstract only).

The claims are drawn to a retrovirus vector that is capable of undergoing promoter conversion and is replication defective. The retrovirus comprises, 5' to 3': U3-R-U5, a first coding sequence encoding a therapeutic peptide, a second sequence encoding a peptide with Sag activity that is linked to a promoter that is active in B and/or T cells and a 3'LTR comprising a

partially or completely deleted U3 region that comprises a tissue-specific promoter that regulates the expression of the first coding sequence, followed by R-U5.

The teachings of Gunzburg et al. and Gilboa are repeated herein. The difference between the claimed invention and the construct of Gunzburg et al. and Gilboa is the tissue specific promoter that replaces the 3' LTR and the B and/or T cell active promoter encoding Sag.

Vile et al. teach retroviral vectors expressing therapeutic genes with tissue specific promoters, see the abstract provided. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to express the heterologous therapeutic gene with a tissue specific promoter to express the gene of interest in a tissue of interest more specifically. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would also have been motivated to express Sag with a T and/or B cell specific promoter to optimize Sag expression in those cells for proliferation, taught by Gunzburg et al. One would also be further motivated to express Sag from a T and/or B cell specific promoter to regulate its expression separately from the therapeutic gene. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of expressing a tissue specific promoter in the 3' U3 region to regulate the expression of the first coding sequence because Gilboa teaches replacing the 3' U3 region with any heterologous promoter and heterologous sequence, see column 4, lines 27-32, column 4, line 56 to column 5, line 26, Figure 2C and claim 25.

Applicant argues that the vectors instantly claimed differ from Gilboa because they are not SIN vectors. Applicant states that the instant vectors regulate expression of a gene within the body of the vector after promoter conversion, which is completely different from the SIN vectors of Gilboa, in which the regulatory elements within the 3' LTR are inactivated.

Page 4

A review of the references as well as applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are found unpersuasive because there is no distinction found between the structural elements found in the 3' LTR instantly claimed and the 3' LTR of Gilboa. The instant construct requires that the U3 region of the 3' LTR to be completely or partially deleted and followed by R-U5. The construct of Gilboa also comprises a completely or partially deleted U3 region of the 3'LTR followed by R-U5, see claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15-17, 19-24 and Figures 4 and 10. Therefore, the structural features of the 3' LTR of the instant construct and the construct of Gilboa are indistinguishable. Applicant asserts that the only mechanism by which a SIN vector can express a gene within the body of the vector is if each gene is linked to a promoter within the body of the vector since the regulatory elements normally found within the 3' U3 sequence is inactivated. However, the instant construct claimed also has inactivated 3' U3 sequences since they are partially or completely deleted. The insertion of a functioning promoter (as applicant states would normally be present) at this defective site ensures expression of a heterologous gene upstream of the body of the vector once the virus is reverse transcribed. The replacement of the wild-type promoter for a promoter that is more specific to the heterologous gene insert would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to restore normal virus replication, control the amount of gene expression and ensure that the gene of interest is only expressed in specifically targeted sites, as evidenced by the teachings of Vile et al.

Applicant also asserts that the instant references do not suggest two coding sequences present within the body of the vector. However, claim 25 of Gilboa is specifically drawn to the retroviral vector "comprising a second, non-retroviral DNA sequence inserted between the 5'

LTR and the 3' LTR of the retroviral vector." The retroviral vector of Gilboa expresses a therapeutic protein, such as human adenosine deaminase (ADA) or a sequence from a pathogen or a hemoglobin protein, see column 8, line 66 to column 9, lines 1 and 13-29. The heterologous genes may be expressed from any promoter of interest, see column 4, lines 27-32, such as the tissue specific promoter taught by Vile et al. The construct of Gilboa also has Sag activity since Gunzburg et al. teach that Sag is present in the U3 region of the 5' MMTV LTR, see Figure 1a. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to express Sag from a heterologous promoter to optimize Sag expression in T and/or B cells and to regulate its expression separately from the therapeutic gene.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanon Foley whose telephone number is (571) 272-0898. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on (571) 272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tpll_free).

Shanon Foley Primary Examiner Art Unit 1648

3